

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 27 is amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-26, 28-30, 32 and 34-35 are allowed.

The Office Action rejects claims 27, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Panter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,832) in view of Stam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,393). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the incorporation of the subject matter of allowable claim 3 into the subject matter of claim 27 renders claim 27 allowable. Moreover, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an object detection apparatus that includes a reliability setting section for setting the reliability of a sensor section provided in a subdivision form by dividing a detection space, as recited in independent claim 31. Also, none of the applied references disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes a determination section that determines whether or not an adaptive task is performed on the basis of the reliability of a sensor section, as recited in independent claim 33.

Panter teaches an apparatus and method for aiming a vehicle headlight to a standard image pattern including a frame moveable relative to the vehicle (Abstract). However, as

admitted by the Patent Office, Panter does not disclose a reliability setting section (Office Action, page 4, lines 6-7), and the Patent Office merely interprets a portion of Panter as representing the reliable storage section. However, the portion of Panter indicated by the Patent Office does not describe the reliability storage section because, as indicated in the specification at, for example, page 34, lines 1-13, the reliability storage section stores a predetermined first reliability which is the reliability of a first parameter assigned to a pixel on the basis of detection information, and the first reliability is derived by a first reliability derivation section. As such, because Panter fails to disclose or suggest a first reliability derived by a first reliability derivation section, Panter fails to disclose or suggest a reliability setting section, as recited in independent claim 31, or a determination section that determines whether or not a task is performed on the basis of the reliability of the sensor section, since Panter does not explicitly teach how the reliability of the sensor section is determined.

Stam teaches a system and method of automatically controlling vehicle headlamps including an image sensor and a controller to generate headlamp control signals (Abstract). However, Stam fails to cure deficiencies in Panter in disclosing or suggesting a reliability setting section, as recited in independent claim 31. Moreover, Stam fails to cure deficiencies in Panter in disclosing or suggesting a determination section that determines whether a task is performed on the basis of the reliability of a sensor section, as recited in independent claim 33.

At least for the reasons above, a combination of Panter and Stam would not arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 31 and 33. As such, because it would not be obvious to combine Panter and Stam to arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 31 and 33, independent claims 31 and 33 are allowable over a combination of Panter and Stam. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-35 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No. 55,478

JAO:TMN/tje

Date: September 8, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--